

**Silicon Valley
Patent Group** LLP2350 Mission College Blvd.
Suite 360
Santa Clara, CA 95054Tel: 408/982-8200
Fax: 408/982-8210

Date:	February 28, 2005		
To:	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Fax: 703-872-9306		
From:	Omkar K. Suryadevara Silicon Valley Patent Group LLP Tel: 408/982-8203 Fax: 408/982-8210		
No. of pages	1 (only this sheet)		
Applicant:	Ramprakash Sathyanarayan		
Title:	File Archival		
Serial No.:	09/834,833	Filing Date:	April 13, 2001
Examiner:	Isaac M. Woo	Group Art Unit:	2162

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 02 2005

Dear Sir/Madam:

Applicant respectfully requests an Examiner Interview by Telephone to be held on March 8, 2005 at 11 AM, in the presence of both, Examiner Woo and primary Examiner Jean Corrielus.

Agenda is to understand the current Office Action, specifically as to what is needed to make the claims allowable over currently cited references.

For example, the Examiner repeatedly stated that US Patent 5,778,389 describes spawning a process (see last line on page 2 of Office Action and lines 3-4 on page 4 of Office Action), but the concept of spawning is not found in this entire patent. Hence, can an agreement be reached that use of multiple processes as in Claim 1 is not anticipated?

As another example, column 5 lines 13-31 in US Patent 5,778,389 does not disclose a limit. Hence, can an agreement be reached that the use of a limit, as stated in Claim 4, is not disclosed in this patent?

As yet another example, column 2, lines 1-30 in US Patent 5,778,389 does not disclose an email message. Hence, can an agreement be reached that use of an email message, as stated in Claim 30, is not disclosed in this patent?

Please call me at 408-982-8203 if there are any questions.

Omkar K. Suryadevara
Rcg. 36,320